REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-24 are pending, claims 1-9, 11-16, 18 and 20 having been amended, and claims 21-24 having been added. The specification was amended to correct typographical errors. Replacement drawings are being filed as formal with this Response.

Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action of April 28, 2005, the Examiner objected to the specification due to an informality on page 1, line 8, of the specification. Applicants amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims 5

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 5 due to an informality in the last line of claim 5. Applicants amended claim 5 as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Objection to Claim 12

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 12 for failing to further limit the subject matter of independent claim 8. Applicants amended claims 8 and 12 such that amended dependent claim 12 now further narrows the subject matter of independent claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112 because the limitation "the audio files" allegedly has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants amended claim 5 such that the insufficient antecedent basis problem is corrected. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6 and 16-19

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,060 to Wolfe et al. ("Wolfe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,444,0641 to Reynar et al. ("Reynar"). Applicants traverse the rejection with respect to claims 1, 3 and 6. Applicants submit that amended claim 16 obviates the rejection with respect to claims 16-19. Claims 1, 3 and 6 were amended only improve presentation.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method for processing voicemail messages. The method includes, among other things, receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, the at least one selection action identifying at least a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Wolfe does not disclose or suggest receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies at least a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1. However, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Reynar. at col. 4, lines 39-51 discloses or suggests a speech to text system that selects a portion of the text that was generated from the speech for synthesis.

Reynar, at col. 4, lines 39-51, discloses:

Often times, the text may be sufficiently different from the dictation that a user cannot recall what was originally spoken based on the visual prompt of the transcribed document alone. In this event, the user may select a portion of text from the display screen and request that the multi-source input and playback utility play aloud the speech used to generate the selected text. Once the user selects a portion of text for playback, the utility highlights the text selected in order to provide visual feedback for the user. This feedback may alternately consist of displaying the selected text in a different color, causing the text to blink, or otherwise distinguishing the selected text from the rest of the document.

Thus, Reynar discloses that the generated text may be different from the original dictation and that the user may not recall the original dictation. In this situation, the user may select a portion of the displayed text to hear a playback of the speech used to generate the selected text. Further, Reynar, at col. 4, lines 62-63, discloses that the user may edit the dictated document to correct speech recognition errors or to add new material.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that it would be obvious to modify the system of Wolfe to select only a portion of the message, as taught by Reynar, to deliver to one or more parties because this would permit the user to send only errorless text to one or more parties. Applicants disagree.

Applicants wish to point out that Reynar discloses a selection feature to select portions of displayed text that may not have been processed correctly by a speech recognizer so that a user may hear the speech that generated the selected portion of the text and make any needed corrections. Reynar does not disclose or suggest using the selection feature to identify at least a portion of the one or more voicemail transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the user. Wolfe discloses transcribing speech and distributing the transcribed speech. Applicants submit that a combination of Wolfe and Reynar would provide a device that permits a user to dictate information for a transcribed document and to select questionable portions of the transcribed document for the purpose of hearing the speech that generated that portion of the document such that the document may be corrected. Further, if the user discovered an error in the selected portion of the text upon hearing the

recorded original speech portion, the user would then correct the text. Therefore, the selected portion having an error would not be a portion that the user would want delivered to other parties.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that the combination of Wolfe and Reynar do not disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, receiving at least one selection action from the one or more users, where the at least one selection action identifies at least a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6 be withdrawn.

Amended claim 16 recites a method including, among other things, receiving, from a user, a selection of at least a portion of the at least one speech message and providing the selected portion to one or more parties specified by the user. Applicants submit that for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, the combination of Wolfe and Reynar do not disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, receiving, from a user, a selection of at least a portion of at least one speech message and providing the selected portion to one or more parties specified by the user, as required by claim 16. As discussed with respect to claim 1, the combination of Wolfe and Reynar would provide a device for a user to select questionable portions of a transcribed document in order to hear the recorded speech that generated the questionable portion so that the user may correct the selected portion. The user would not want to provide the selected questionable portion to one or more parties.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 16 and dependent claims 17-19 are patentable over Wolfe in view of Reynar and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16-19 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-15 and 20

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7-15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over <u>Wolfe</u> in view of <u>Reynar</u> and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,360 to <u>Davidson et al</u>. ("<u>Davidson</u>"). Applicants traverse the rejection with respect to claims 2, 4, 5 and 7-15. Applicants submit that amended claim 16 obviates the rejection with respect to claim 20. Applicants submit that amendments to claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 were not made to overcome the prior art rejections and do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 depend from amended claim 1. Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 are patentable over <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u> for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that <u>Davidson</u> fails to make up for the deficiencies of <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u>. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 are patentable over <u>Wolfe</u>, <u>Reynar</u> and <u>Davidson</u> and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 be withdrawn.

Amended claim 8 has features similar to the features of claim 1 and is patentable over <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u> for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. <u>Davidson</u> fails to make up for the deficiencies of <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u>. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 and dependent claims 9-15 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from claim 16, which is patentable over <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u> for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Applicants submit that <u>Davidson</u> fails to make up for the deficiencies of <u>Wolfe</u> and <u>Reynar</u>. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over <u>Wolfe</u>, <u>Reynar</u> and <u>Davidson</u> and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20 be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claim 21 recites features similar to those of claim 1 and is patentable for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all objections and rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2005

By: _Richard C. Irving_

Correspondence Address:
Samuel H. Dworetsky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433